

# THE CAROLINA SPARTAN.

BY CAVIS & TRIMMIE.

Devoted to Southern Rights, Politics, Agriculture, and Miscellany.

82 PER ANNUM.

VOL. XIII.

SPARTANBURG, S. C., THURSDAY, JULY 3, 1856.

NO. 19.

## THE CAROLINA SPARTAN.

BY CAVIS & TRIMMIE.

T. O. P. VERNON, Associate Editor.

Price Two Dollars per annum in advance, or \$1.00 at the end of the year. If not paid until after the year expires \$2.00.

Advertisements inserted at the usual rates, and contracts made on reasonable terms.

MR. BROOKS AND MR. SUMNER.

### EXTRACTS FROM THE SPEECH OF A. P. BUTLER, OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

IN THE SENATE, JUNE 12, 1856.

On the bill to enable the people of Kansas Territory to form a Constitution and State Government, preparatory to their admission into the Union when they have the requisite population.

MR. BUTLER: Mr. President, the occasion and the subject upon which I am about to address the Senate of the United States, at this time, have been brought about by events over which I have had no control, and could have had none—events which have grown out of the commencement of a controversy for which the Senate of Massachusetts (not now in his seat) [Mr. Sumner] should be held exclusively responsible to his country and his God. He has delivered a speech the most extraordinary that has ever had utterance in any deliberative body regarding the sanctions of laws and decency. When it was delivered I was not here, and if I had been present, what I should have done it would be perfectly idle for me now to say; because no one can substitute the deliberations of a subsequent period for such as might have influenced him at another time and under different circumstances. My impression now is that, if I had been present, I should have asked the Senator, before he finished some of the paragraphs personally applicable to myself, to pause; and if he had gone on, I would have demanded of him, the next morning, that he should review his speech, and retract or modify it, so as to bring it within the sphere of parliamentary propriety. If he had refused this, what I would have done I cannot say; yet I can say that I would not have submitted to it. But what mode of redress I should have resorted to I cannot tell.

I wish I had been here. I would have at least assumed, as I ought to have done, on my responsibility as a Senator, and on my responsibility as a representative of South Carolina, all the consequences, let them lead where they might; but instead of that, the speech has involved his own friends and his own colleagues. It has involved my friends. It has involved one of them to such an extent that, at this time, he has been obliged to put his fortune and his life at stake. And, sir, if the consequences which are likely to flow from that speech hereafter shall end in blood and violence, that Senator should be prepared to repent in sackcloth and ashes.

Now, I pronounce a judgment on that speech which will be adopted by the public. I am as certain as I am speaking that it is now condemned by the public mind, and by posterity it will be consigned to infamy, for the mischievous consequences which have flowed from it already, and such as are likely yet to disturb the peace and repose of the country.

I said nothing, Mr. President, at any period of my life—much less did I say anything in the course of the debate to which the Senator from Massachusetts purports to have made a reply—that could have called for, much less have justified, the gross personal abuse, insinuation, and calumny, to which he has resorted.

When I was at my little farm, enjoying myself quietly, and as I thought had taken refuge from the stings and contentions of the Senate and of politics, a message was brought to me that my kinsman had been involved in a difficulty on my account. It was so vague that I did not know how to account for it. I was far from any telegraphic communication. I did not wait five minutes before I left home to put myself within the reach of such information—and garbled even that was—as was accessible. I traveled four days continuously to Washington; and when I arrived I found the very subject under discussion which had given me so much anxiety; and it has been a source of the deepest concern to my feelings ever since I heard it, on many accounts—on account of my country, and on account of the honor and the safety of my kinsman. When I arrived here, I found the subject under discussion. I went to the Senate worn down by travel; and I then gave notice that, when the resolutions from Massachusetts should be presented, I would speak to them, as coming from a Commonwealth whose history, and whose lessons of history, had inspired me with the very highest admiration—I would speak to them from a respect to a Commonwealth, while, perhaps, the Senator who had been the cause of their introduction ought not to deserve any notice, and would not have received it.

Well, sir, days passed, and those resolutions were not presented. Now they have been presented, and presented in a different way from any that I have ever known to be submitted from any Commonwealth before. They were not presented by one of its Senators, but were sent directly to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. I waited for some time with the expectation that, when those resolutions should come, I would acquit myself of the painful task which circumstances had devolved upon me. They did not come until yesterday—more than two weeks after their adoption.

In the mean time—on Monday last—I gave notice that I would address the Senate to-day under the confident belief, not that the present Senator [Mr. Wilson] would be here—because I have nothing to do with him—but that the Senator who has been the aggressor, the criminal aggressor, in this matter would be present; and if I can give credence to the testimony of Dr. Boyle, I see no reason why he should not be present. For anything that appears in that testimony, if he had been an officer of the army, and had not appeared the next day on the battle field, he would have deserved to be cashiered.

Sir, I am at a loss to know why he has aimed his assaults at me individually, and at my State on more occasions than one; but I am willing to adopt the view afforded by the Rev. Mr. Beecher; and, as it is a clew upon the subject, I rely on it. I wish nothing of mine to go out that I do not intend to be entirely consistent with the convictions of my mind. I ask to have Mr. Beecher's remarks read. I adopt them, and they will acquit the Senator—or they will go very far to acquit him.

The Secretary read, as follows: "The only complaint which I have ever heard of Senator Sumner has been this: that he, by his shrinking and sensitive nature, was not fit for the rough and tumble of politics in our day. He would have held himself back, and avoided giving the slightest offence, had it not been that he was reproved and goaded into it by, as I think, the injudicious criticism of friends."

Mr. Butler, Sir, I believe it, and it will acquit his motives to some extent. Instead of making his speech here his own, as a Senator, under the obligations of the Constitution, and the highest sanctions which can influence the conduct of an honorable man—instead of making it the vehicle of high thoughts and noble emotions that would become a man and a Senator, it is obvious now that he has made that speech but the conduit—it will use a stronger expression—the fang, through which to express upon the public the compound poison of untruth and injustice.

This is confirmed by his remarkable exordium, for, in many respects, this is the most extraordinary speech that has ever found its way in any book, or upon any occasion, ancient or modern. I have never before heard of protest or exordium by proclamation, or by a telegraphic proclamation to Theodore Parker, who was a friend and his friend, by a telegraphic proclamation to Theodore Parker, he uttered this remarkable sentence: "Whilst you are deliberating in your meeting, I am about to pronounce the most thorough philippic that was ever heard in the Senate of the United States." This is in conformity with Mr. Parker's opinion. He was a flexible conformist, invoking the spirit of Theodore Parker as his muse to sustain him in the strife for which, by his nature and his talents, he was not fit. Sir, it was the tribute and deference of a flexible conformist, willing to be a rhetorical fabricator to carry out the views and subserve the purposes of a man who, as I understand, is of an iron will and robust intellect; who loves controversy, and has abilities which more fit him, perhaps for that, than for wistfully playing the lamb as the emblem of innocence, and as the prototype of that Christ whose crimes he has professed. To conciliate Parker, the Senator must make war upon South Carolina and upon myself. If he supposed that he would gain laurels by any attack on me because I was a "foeman worthy of his steel," I might feel complimented; but there was no such purpose. It was to parody to the prejudices of Massachusetts, or of a portion of Massachusetts—for God forbid that I should say anything which is not proper of Massachusetts—to parody to a portion of Massachusetts by assailing South Carolina. Before I finish I shall say what I think, and if he were here in his place I would make him hang his head in shame; for I will demonstrate, before I conclude, that in what he has said of South Carolina he has assailed the nearest and dearest comrade of his mother. Yes, sir, a degenerate son, incapable of appreciating the relations which subsisted between Massachusetts and South Carolina at a time when there was something more of peril to be encountered than exhibitions of rhetoric in the Senate of the United States; when men placed their lives and their fortunes on the issues which had been made. I will prove him a calumniator. While he has charged me with mistaking history, law, and the Constitution, let me say that "the who lives in glass houses should not throw stones." I here say, and I pledge myself to it, that I will convict him, and shall demand of the Senate a verdict of guilty.

But, Mr. President, there is one result of this speech which I think may be regarded as good. He has shown, as Mr. Beecher says, that he is unfit for the war of debate. He has no business to gather the glories of the Senate Chamber and fling with orators, unless he is prepared to maintain the position of an honorable combatant. Though his friends have invested him with the dress of Achilles and offered him his armor, he has shown that he is only able to fight with the weapons of Thersites, and covered what that braver received from the hands of the gallant Ulysses.

Now, sir, I proceed to make my points; and I shall show that what the Senator said of myself, and South Carolina, was not in response to anything which I said; that he has gone outside the record to bring in to the debate matters which did not legitimately belong to it by association or connection. I will maintain these three propositions so certainly, that, in my opinion, there will not be one mind here, unless it be disposed to morally perjure itself, which will not acquiesce in them. I will show that his remarks upon me and South Carolina were untrue and unjust; that the language used was licentious; the spirit which prompted it was aggressive; and the whole tenor and tone of the speech was malignant and insulting.

In no speech which I have made during this session did I name Massachusetts or South Carolina. This is a most remarkable thing, considering the nature of the debate. I have called what I said, and I have not introduced South Carolina by name into the debate, nor have I brought in Massachusetts. Yet, sir, this Senator alludes to me in two paragraphs. I should like to know why he did not finish his picture in one sketch on the first day, when he spoke of me as being "Don Quixote in love with slavery as a mistress, because she was a harlot." I dislike to repeat the obscenity of his illustration. When he had me under review then, why did he not finish me in that general sketch? He took another night; and during that night the chaotic conceptions either emanated from his own mind or were suggested to it by those busy people who seem to have control over him; and then it was that he made this celebrated attack on me, assailing my reputation as a gentleman of veracity.

Here Judge Butler quotes Mr. Sumner's attack on him, and proceeds: "Now, Mr. President, I am going to state a proposition which will strike the Senate: what he here undertakes to quote as the constitution of South Carolina, in reference to the eligibility of members of the Legislature, is not to be found in it at all. How did he bring it in in response to any speech of mine? He has sworn in his affidavit that what he said was fairly in response to the speeches which I had made. I put the question to Senators, and I shall pause for their sentence; how dare he, from anything in my speeches, put his finger—his profane finger—upon the constitution of South Carolina? Is that a response to anything which I said? My speeches heretofore delivered are upon record, and can be referred to. I neither allude to the constitution of South Carolina, nor did I mention South Carolina in the whole debate; and yet in his affidavit he says that all these are fairly referable as a response to the remarks of the Senator from South Carolina. What he has quoted here is not in the constitution of South Carolina; and when he undertakes to subject me to the severity of his criticisms, as a blunderer in the statements of law and constitution, let him stand convicted of one of two things—either that he did not read the constitution of South Carolina himself, and adopted it from others, or that, if he read it, he could not understand it. I intend to dwell upon this point with a view to convict him—not that I am going to vindicate the constitution of South Carolina, but I will convict this rhetorical jurist—this man who undertakes to sit on the tripod, and publish the oracles of Delphi to sit upon me as a lawyer! My God, what have I come to! A man who never managed a case (as far as I know) in court, to sit on myself, who have been thirty-five years engaged in law, either in appearing at the bar, or expounding it on the bench! I have never delivered a judgment on a question of law here, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, whether I have made the majority for the minority report, when that Senator has not concurred with me; or if he differed, it has been on sectional questions on which he has been overruled by the overwhelming majority of the Senate. Yet, a man who is agreed with me always—and that is the only bad sign about it [laughter]—undertakes to sit in judgment on my legal attainments! His authority is worth anything, it is with me, for he has concurred with me. On all the contested election cases we have agreed, except, perhaps, in the Phelps case. There he may have differed from me; but if he did the Senate overruled him.

That, however, is not the question which I was approaching. I said that what he stated in reference to the constitution of South Carolina was not in response to anything which had fallen from me, and that there was no such thing to be found in the constitution of South Carolina as he has quoted. I will read the clause: "No person shall be eligible to a seat in the House of Representatives, unless he is a free white man, of the age of twenty-one years, and hath been a citizen and resident of this State three years previous to his election. If a resident in the election district, he shall not be eligible to a seat in the House of Representatives, unless he is legally seized and possessed, in his own right, of a settled freehold estate of five hundred acres of land, and ten negroes; or of a real estate of the value of one hundred and fifty pounds sterling, clear of debt." I have got him; I call on Senators to convict him. There is but one verdict which can be rendered. He has gone out of the way to assail the constitution of South Carolina, and, in assailing it, he is guilty of the worst of all faults. I cannot conceive of a worse predicament than his own, professing pedantic accuracy, and sitting in judgment on the quotations of others, is reduced to the alternative of admitting that he never read what he quoted, or, if he had read it could not understand it or garbled it.

South Carolina. This is a most remarkable thing, considering the nature of the debate. I have called what I said, and I have not introduced South Carolina by name into the debate, nor have I brought in Massachusetts. Yet, sir, this Senator alludes to me in two paragraphs. I should like to know why he did not finish his picture in one sketch on the first day, when he spoke of me as being "Don Quixote in love with slavery as a mistress, because she was a harlot." I dislike to repeat the obscenity of his illustration. When he had me under review then, why did he not finish me in that general sketch? He took another night; and during that night the chaotic conceptions either emanated from his own mind or were suggested to it by those busy people who seem to have control over him; and then it was that he made this celebrated attack on me, assailing my reputation as a gentleman of veracity.

Here Judge Butler quotes Mr. Sumner's attack on him, and proceeds: "Now, Mr. President, I am going to state a proposition which will strike the Senate: what he here undertakes to quote as the constitution of South Carolina, in reference to the eligibility of members of the Legislature, is not to be found in it at all. How did he bring it in in response to any speech of mine? He has sworn in his affidavit that what he said was fairly in response to the speeches which I had made. I put the question to Senators, and I shall pause for their sentence; how dare he, from anything in my speeches, put his finger—his profane finger—upon the constitution of South Carolina? Is that a response to anything which I said? My speeches heretofore delivered are upon record, and can be referred to. I neither allude to the constitution of South Carolina, nor did I mention South Carolina in the whole debate; and yet in his affidavit he says that all these are fairly referable as a response to the remarks of the Senator from South Carolina. What he has quoted here is not in the constitution of South Carolina; and when he undertakes to subject me to the severity of his criticisms, as a blunderer in the statements of law and constitution, let him stand convicted of one of two things—either that he did not read the constitution of South Carolina himself, and adopted it from others, or that, if he read it, he could not understand it. I intend to dwell upon this point with a view to convict him—not that I am going to vindicate the constitution of South Carolina, but I will convict this rhetorical jurist—this man who undertakes to sit on the tripod, and publish the oracles of Delphi to sit upon me as a lawyer! My God, what have I come to! A man who never managed a case (as far as I know) in court, to sit on myself, who have been thirty-five years engaged in law, either in appearing at the bar, or expounding it on the bench! I have never delivered a judgment on a question of law here, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, whether I have made the majority for the minority report, when that Senator has not concurred with me; or if he differed, it has been on sectional questions on which he has been overruled by the overwhelming majority of the Senate. Yet, a man who is agreed with me always—and that is the only bad sign about it [laughter]—undertakes to sit in judgment on my legal attainments! His authority is worth anything, it is with me, for he has concurred with me. On all the contested election cases we have agreed, except, perhaps, in the Phelps case. There he may have differed from me; but if he did the Senate overruled him.

That, however, is not the question which I was approaching. I said that what he stated in reference to the constitution of South Carolina was not in response to anything which had fallen from me, and that there was no such thing to be found in the constitution of South Carolina as he has quoted. I will read the clause: "No person shall be eligible to a seat in the House of Representatives, unless he is a free white man, of the age of twenty-one years, and hath been a citizen and resident of this State three years previous to his election. If a resident in the election district, he shall not be eligible to a seat in the House of Representatives, unless he is legally seized and possessed, in his own right, of a settled freehold estate of five hundred acres of land, and ten negroes; or of a real estate of the value of one hundred and fifty pounds sterling, clear of debt." I have got him; I call on Senators to convict him. There is but one verdict which can be rendered. He has gone out of the way to assail the constitution of South Carolina, and, in assailing it, he is guilty of the worst of all faults. I cannot conceive of a worse predicament than his own, professing pedantic accuracy, and sitting in judgment on the quotations of others, is reduced to the alternative of admitting that he never read what he quoted, or, if he had read it could not understand it or garbled it.

Our Southern confederates are entitled to civility, because they are men and brethren; and they are entitled to kindness and courtesy from us of Boston, because we owe them a debt of gratitude which it would be shameful to forget. Since we, of the North, have presumed to be undertaken upon this occasion, let us do the thing "DE CENTER ET ORATE." Besides, our friends of the South are notoriously testy and hot-headed; they are, geographically, children of the sun. John Smith's description of the

Massachusetts Indians, in 1614, Richmond edition, 2, 194, is truly applicable to the Southern people: very kind, but in their fury, no less valiant.

"I am no more inclined to uphold the South in the continued practice of a moral wrong, because they gave us bread when we were hungry, as they certainly did, than was Sir Matthew Hale to decide favorably for the suitor who sent him the fat back."

"June 24, 1774. Twenty-four days after the port bill went into operation, a public meeting was held at Charleston, South Carolina. The moving spirits were the Trappers and the Elliotts, the Horries and the Clarks, the Gaddisons and the Pinckneys, of that day; and resolutions were passed full of brotherly love and sympathy for the inhabitants of Boston."

"New York, August 15, 1774. Saturday last Captain Dickinson arrived here, and brought three hundred and seventy-six barrels of rye from South Carolina, to be sold, and proceeds remitted to Boston, a present to the sufferers; a still larger cargo is to be shipped for the like benevolent purposes."

"Let the work of abolition go forward in a dignified and decent spirit. Let us argue; and so far as we rightfully may, let us legislate. Let us bring the whole world's sympathy up to the work of emancipation. But let us not revile and vituperate those who are, to all intents and purposes, our brethren, as certainly as if they lived just over the Roxbury line, instead of Mason and Dixon's. Such harsh and unmitigated scolding and abuse, as we too often witness, are equally ungracious, ungentlemanly and ungrateful."

The Senator says that the Southern States, in consequence of slavery, betrayed during the revolutionary war a "shameful imbecility." I challenge him to the truth of his story. There was not a battle fought south of the Potomac which was not fought by Southern troops and slaveholders, even if you choose to exclude Pennsylvania, which was at that time a slaveholding State. Mullenberg's continental regiment was always with them, and I love to allude to it; but not a New England squad, company, or regiment ever passed the Potomac; and yet the Senator says that but for northern aid the Southern States could not have sustained themselves.

Sir, who fought the battle of King's Mountain? It was not fought by anybody in pay. Patriots fought it, but they never received a dollar. That battle made an impression; perhaps the most remarkable of any during the war. It turned the tide of events. Who fought the battle of Cowpens? There was none in that battle from the north of Maryland. The commander in that battle was Daniel Morgan; the hero of the day was perhaps John Eager Howard. Col. Washington, commander of the cavalry, and Pickens, a citizen of South Carolina, and one of the heroes of the war, never struck from their duty. It has been said of the South Carolina militia, during the Revolutionary war, that they were on a par with troops who stood to their guns and position, whenever they were mustered in to the service, and called upon to perform duty.

Who fought the battle of Hobbs' Hill? General Green was the commander; and he afterwards became a slaveholder, and, of his own choice, lived and died in a Southern State, among friends and comrades in arms. Who fought the battle of Eutaw? Was there any New England regiment, or company, or squad there? None. That battle, the most distinguished which has ever been fought in the southern portion of the Confederacy, was fought by Southern slaveholders from Maryland, Virginia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Georgia. They were exclusively Southern troops. In the face of these facts, the Senator said the imbecility of the South, arising from slavery, was such that they could not fight their battles without aid.

Shame! I call upon the shade of a Hancock and Adams to look down and reprove a degenerate son who can thus invade the very sanctuary of the history which has given them immortality.

Do you think that, sir, by this remark I reproach the troops of New England? No, sir. When Yorktown surrendered, there was a list of the troops who were present. But because I say that Southern troops and those from Pennsylvania alone engaged in these distinguished battles, do I reproach the troops of Massachusetts? God forbid! They were under the command of Washington at the time when he went to Yorktown, and, as was his duty, he sent them to defend the vulnerable points of New York and Boston.

Now I will make a remark which I hope the Senate will remember: Notwithstanding their relative numbers compared with the pay list of New England, you may take the fighting days—if you have a mind to compute it as you would labor—you may take the fighting days during which the troops of South Carolina were engaged, and in the computation the balance will be found greatly against Massachusetts. If you have a mind to draw some other test—if you wish to test the question of sacrifice, and measure it by blood, South Carolina has poured out hogsheads of blood where gallons have been poured out by Massachusetts.

In proof of this I give a list of battles fought in South Carolina, and each was a bloody battle: Battle of Fort Moultrie. Battle of Stono. Siege of Charleston. Battle of Camden. Battle of Hanging Rock. Battle of Magrove's Mill. Battle of Blackstocks. Battle of Georgetown, and the battle at Black Bluffs, by Marion. Battle of King's Mountain. Battle of Cowpens. Battle of Fish Dam Ford, by Sumner. Battle at Ninety Six. Battle at Fort Galphin.

Who fought the battle of King's Mountain? It was not fought by anybody in pay. Patriots fought it, but they never received a dollar. That battle made an impression; perhaps the most remarkable of any during the war. It turned the tide of events. Who fought the battle of Cowpens? There was none in that battle from the north of Maryland. The commander in that battle was Daniel Morgan; the hero of the day was perhaps John Eager Howard. Col. Washington, commander of the cavalry, and Pickens, a citizen of South Carolina, and one of the heroes of the war, never struck from their duty. It has been said of the South Carolina militia, during the Revolutionary war, that they were on a par with troops who stood to their guns and position, whenever they were mustered in to the service, and called upon to perform duty.

Who fought the battle of Hobbs' Hill? General Green was the commander; and he afterwards became a slaveholder, and, of his own choice, lived and died in a Southern State, among friends and comrades in arms. Who fought the battle of Eutaw? Was there any New England regiment, or company, or squad there? None. That battle, the most distinguished which has ever been fought in the southern portion of the Confederacy, was fought by Southern slaveholders from Maryland, Virginia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Georgia. They were exclusively Southern troops. In the face of these facts, the Senator said the imbecility of the South, arising from slavery, was such that they could not fight their battles without aid.

Shame! I call upon the shade of a Hancock and Adams to look down and reprove a degenerate son who can thus invade the very sanctuary of the history which has given them immortality.

Do you think that, sir, by this remark I reproach the troops of New England? No, sir. When Yorktown surrendered, there was a list of the troops who were present. But because I say that Southern troops and those from Pennsylvania alone engaged in these distinguished battles, do I reproach the troops of Massachusetts? God forbid! They were under the command of Washington at the time when he went to Yorktown, and, as was his duty, he sent them to defend the vulnerable points of New York and Boston.

Now I will make a remark which I hope the Senate will remember: Notwithstanding their relative numbers compared with the pay list of New England, you may take the fighting days—if you have a mind to compute it as you would labor—you may take the fighting days during which the troops of South Carolina were engaged, and in the computation the balance will be found greatly against Massachusetts. If you have a mind to draw some other test—if you wish to test the question of sacrifice, and measure it by blood, South Carolina has poured out hogsheads of blood where gallons have been poured out by Massachusetts.

In proof of this I give a list of battles fought in South Carolina, and each was a bloody battle: Battle of Fort Moultrie. Battle of Stono. Siege of Charleston. Battle of Camden. Battle of Hanging Rock. Battle of Magrove's Mill. Battle of Blackstocks. Battle of Georgetown, and the battle at Black Bluffs, by Marion. Battle of King's Mountain. Battle of Cowpens. Battle of Fish Dam Ford, by Sumner. Battle at Ninety Six. Battle at Fort Galphin.

Who fought the battle of King's Mountain? It was not fought by anybody in pay. Patriots fought it, but they never received a dollar. That battle made an impression; perhaps the most remarkable of any during the war. It turned the tide of events. Who fought the battle of Cowpens? There was none in that battle from the north of Maryland. The commander in that battle was Daniel Morgan; the hero of the day was perhaps John Eager Howard. Col. Washington, commander of the cavalry, and Pickens, a citizen of South Carolina, and one of the heroes of the war, never struck from their duty. It has been said of the South Carolina militia, during the Revolutionary war, that they were on a par with troops who stood to their guns and position, whenever they were mustered in to the service, and called upon to perform duty.

Who fought the battle of Hobbs' Hill? General Green was the commander; and he afterwards became a slaveholder, and, of his own choice, lived and died in a Southern State, among friends and comrades in arms. Who fought the battle of Eutaw? Was there any New England regiment, or company, or squad there? None. That battle, the most distinguished which has ever been fought in the southern portion of the Confederacy, was fought by Southern slaveholders from Maryland, Virginia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Georgia. They were exclusively Southern troops. In the face of these facts, the Senator said the imbecility of the South, arising from slavery, was such that they could not fight their battles without aid.

Shame! I call upon the shade of a Hancock and Adams to look down and reprove a degenerate son who can thus invade the very sanctuary of the history which has given them immortality.

Do you think that, sir, by this remark I reproach the troops of New England? No, sir. When Yorktown surrendered, there was a list of the troops who were present. But because I say that Southern troops and those from Pennsylvania alone engaged in these distinguished battles, do I reproach the troops of Massachusetts? God forbid! They were under the command of Washington at the time when he went to Yorktown, and, as was his duty, he sent them to defend the vulnerable points of New York and Boston.

Now I will make a remark which I hope the Senate will remember: Notwithstanding their relative numbers compared with the pay list of New England, you may take the fighting days—if you have a mind to compute it as you would labor—you may take the fighting days during which the troops of South Carolina were engaged, and in the computation the balance will be found greatly against Massachusetts. If you have a mind to draw some other test—if you wish to test the question of sacrifice, and measure it by blood, South Carolina has poured out hogsheads of blood where gallons have been poured out by Massachusetts.

In proof of this I give a list of battles fought in South Carolina, and each was a bloody battle: Battle of Fort Moultrie. Battle of Stono. Siege of Charleston. Battle of Camden. Battle of Hanging Rock. Battle of Magrove's Mill. Battle of Blackstocks. Battle of Georgetown, and the battle at Black Bluffs, by Marion. Battle of King's Mountain. Battle of Cowpens. Battle of Fish Dam Ford, by Sumner. Battle at Ninety Six. Battle at Fort Galphin.

Who fought the battle of King's Mountain? It was not fought by anybody in pay. Patriots fought it, but they never received a dollar. That battle made an impression; perhaps the most remarkable of any during the war. It turned the tide of events. Who fought the battle of Cowpens? There was none in that battle from the north of Maryland. The commander in that battle was Daniel Morgan; the hero of the day was perhaps John Eager Howard. Col. Washington, commander of the cavalry, and Pickens, a citizen of South Carolina, and one of the heroes of the war, never struck from their duty. It has been said of the South Carolina militia, during the Revolutionary war, that they were on a par with troops who stood to their guns and position, whenever they were mustered in to the service, and called upon to perform duty.

Who fought the battle of Hobbs' Hill? General Green was the commander; and he afterwards became a slaveholder, and, of his own choice, lived and died in a Southern State, among friends and comrades in arms. Who fought the battle of Eutaw? Was there any New England regiment, or company, or squad there? None. That battle, the most distinguished which has ever been fought in the southern portion of the Confederacy, was fought by Southern slaveholders from Maryland, Virginia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Georgia. They were exclusively Southern troops. In the face of these facts, the Senator said the imbecility of the South, arising from slavery, was such that they could not fight their battles without aid.

Shame! I call upon the shade of a Hancock and Adams to look down and reprove a degenerate son who can thus invade the very sanctuary of the history which has given them immortality.

Do you think that, sir, by this remark I reproach the troops of New England? No, sir. When Yorktown surrendered, there was a list of the troops who were present. But because I say that Southern troops and those from Pennsylvania alone engaged in these distinguished battles, do I reproach the troops of Massachusetts? God forbid! They were under the command of Washington at the time when he went to Yorktown, and, as was his duty, he sent them to defend the vulnerable points of New York and Boston.

Now I will make a remark which I hope the Senate will remember: Notwithstanding their relative numbers compared with the pay list of New England, you may take the fighting days—if you have a mind to compute it as you would labor—you may take the fighting days during which the troops of South Carolina were engaged, and in the computation the balance will be found greatly against Massachusetts. If you have a mind to draw some other test—if you wish to test the question of sacrifice, and measure it by blood, South Carolina has poured out hogsheads of blood where gallons have been poured out by Massachusetts.

Who fought the battle of King's Mountain? It was not fought by anybody in pay. Patriots fought it, but they never received a dollar. That battle made an impression; perhaps the most remarkable of any during the war. It turned the tide of events. Who fought the battle of Cowpens? There was none in that battle from the north of Maryland. The commander in that battle was Daniel Morgan; the hero of the day was perhaps John Eager Howard. Col. Washington, commander of the cavalry, and Pickens, a citizen of South Carolina, and one of the heroes of the war, never struck from their duty. It has been said of the South Carolina militia, during the Revolutionary war, that they were on a par with troops who stood to their guns and position, whenever they were mustered in to the service, and called upon to perform duty.

Who fought the battle of Hobbs' Hill? General Green was the commander; and he afterwards became a slaveholder, and, of his own choice, lived and died in a Southern State, among friends and comrades in arms. Who fought the battle of Eutaw? Was there any New England regiment, or company, or squad there? None. That battle, the most distinguished which has ever been fought in the southern portion of the Confederacy, was fought by Southern slaveholders from Maryland, Virginia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Georgia. They were exclusively Southern troops. In the face of these facts, the Senator said the imbecility of the South, arising from slavery, was such that they could not fight their battles without aid.

Shame! I call upon the shade of a Hancock and Adams to look down and reprove a degenerate son who can thus invade the very sanctuary of the history which has given them immortality.

Do you think that, sir, by this remark I reproach the troops of New England? No, sir. When Yorktown surrendered, there was a list of the troops who were present. But because I say that Southern troops and those from Pennsylvania alone engaged in these distinguished battles, do I reproach the troops of Massachusetts? God forbid! They were under the command of Washington at the time when he went to Yorktown, and, as was his duty, he sent them to defend the vulnerable points of New York and Boston.

Now I will make a remark which I hope the Senate will remember: Notwithstanding their relative numbers compared with the pay list of New England, you may take the fighting days—if you have a mind to compute it as you would labor—you may take the fighting days during which the troops of South Carolina were engaged, and in the computation the balance will be found greatly against Massachusetts. If you have a mind to draw some other test—if you wish to test the question of sacrifice, and measure it by blood, South Carolina has poured out hogsheads of blood where gallons have been poured out by Massachusetts.

In proof of this I give a list of battles fought in South Carolina, and each was a bloody battle: Battle of Fort Moultrie. Battle of Stono. Siege of Charleston. Battle of Camden. Battle of Hanging Rock. Battle of Magrove's Mill. Battle of Blackstocks. Battle of Georgetown, and the battle at Black Bluffs, by Marion. Battle of King's Mountain. Battle of Cowpens. Battle of Fish Dam Ford, by Sumner. Battle at Ninety Six. Battle at Fort Galphin.

Who fought the battle of King's Mountain? It was not fought by anybody in pay. Patriots fought it, but they never received a dollar. That battle made an impression; perhaps the most remarkable of any during the war. It turned the tide of events. Who fought the battle of Cowpens? There was none in that battle from the north of Maryland. The commander in that battle was Daniel Morgan; the hero of the day was perhaps John Eager Howard. Col. Washington, commander of the cavalry, and Pickens, a citizen of South Carolina, and one of the heroes of the war, never struck from their duty. It has been said of the South Carolina militia, during the Revolutionary war, that they were on a par with troops who stood to their guns and position, whenever they were mustered in to the service, and called upon to perform duty.

Who fought the battle of Hobbs' Hill? General Green was the commander; and he afterwards became a slaveholder, and, of his own choice, lived and died in a Southern State, among friends and comrades in arms. Who fought the battle of Eutaw? Was there any New England regiment, or company, or squad there? None. That battle, the most distinguished which has ever been fought in the southern portion of the Confederacy, was fought by Southern slaveholders from Maryland, Virginia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Georgia. They were exclusively Southern troops. In the face of these facts, the Senator said the imbecility of the South, arising from slavery, was such that they could not fight their battles without aid.

Shame! I call upon the shade of a Hancock and Adams to look down and reprove a degenerate son who can thus invade the very sanctuary of the history which has given them immortality.

Do you think that, sir, by this remark I reproach the troops of New England? No, sir. When Yorktown surrendered, there was a list of the troops who were present. But because I say that Southern troops and those from Pennsylvania alone engaged in these distinguished battles, do I reproach the troops of Massachusetts? God forbid! They were under the command of Washington at the time when he went to Yorktown, and, as was his duty, he sent them to defend the vulnerable points of New York and Boston.

Now I will make a remark which I hope the Senate will remember: Notwithstanding their relative numbers compared with the pay list of New England, you may take the fighting days—if you have a mind to compute it as you would labor—you may take the fighting days during which the troops of South Carolina were engaged, and in the computation the balance will be found greatly against Massachusetts. If you have a mind to draw some other test—if you wish to test the question of sacrifice, and measure it by blood, South Carolina has poured out hogsheads of blood where gallons have been poured out by Massachusetts.

Who fought the battle of King's Mountain? It was not fought by anybody in pay. Patriots fought it, but they never received a dollar. That battle made an impression; perhaps the most remarkable of any during the war. It turned the tide of events. Who fought the battle of Cowpens? There was none in that battle from the north of Maryland. The commander in that battle was Daniel Morgan; the hero of the day was perhaps John Eager Howard. Col. Washington, commander of the cavalry, and Pickens, a citizen of South Carolina, and one of the heroes of the war, never struck from their duty. It has been said of the South Carolina militia, during the Revolutionary war, that they were on a par with troops who stood to their guns and position, whenever they were mustered in to the service, and called upon to perform duty.

Who fought the battle of Hobbs' Hill? General Green was the commander; and he afterwards became a slaveholder, and, of his own choice, lived and died in a Southern State, among friends and comrades in arms. Who fought the battle of Eutaw? Was there any New England regiment, or company, or squad there? None. That battle, the most distinguished which has ever been fought in the southern portion of the Confederacy, was fought by Southern slaveholders from Maryland, Virginia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Georgia. They were exclusively Southern troops. In the face of these facts, the Senator said the imbecility of the South, arising from slavery, was such that they could not fight their battles without aid.

Shame! I call upon the shade of a Hancock and Adams to look down and reprove a degenerate son who can thus invade the very sanctuary of the history which has given them immortality.

Do you think that, sir, by this remark I reproach the troops of New England? No, sir. When Yorktown surrendered, there was a list of the troops who were present. But because I say that Southern troops and those from Pennsylvania alone engaged in these distinguished battles, do I reproach the troops of Massachusetts? God forbid! They were under